



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,026	09/13/2001	Fred Savrij-Droste	060953/0127	4998

22428 7590 07/11/2003

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

SHERRER, CURTIS EDWARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/806,026

Applicant(s)

SAVRIJ-DROSTE ET AL.

Examiner

Curtis E. Sherrer

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/13/01.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 7-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 7-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Figures 1-12 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 4-20 been renumbered 7-25.

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "party" should be spelled "partly." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants added new claims to the application containing the process limitation of providing a cartridge that is in the filled and closed situation of the container at least partially filled with a second gas under pressure, and no basis for this limitation was found or provided.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 7-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is indefinite because it is not clear if the phrase “for instance aluminum, . . . , or other plastic” is meant to be a positive limitation upon the claim. For the purposes of this action, it is considered that it acts as a Markush grouping.

Claim 1 is indefinite because there is no antecedent basis for the phrase “the filled and closed situation.”

Claim 7 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase “aromatic component” is unknown.

Claim 8 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase “general shape of a beaker” is unknown. Further, there is no antecedent basis for the phrase “the edge zone.”

Claim 9 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase “party (sic) undercut peripheral zone” is unknown. Further, there is no antecedent basis for the phrase “which edge zone.”

Art Unit: 1761

Claim 10 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase "snap means" is unknown.

Claim 11 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase "compressed at least partially" is unknown.

Claim 12 is indefinite because there is no antecedent basis for the phrase "the outside."

Claim 19 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase "" is unknown.

Claim 20 is indefinite because it is not clear if the phrase "for instance a lacquer coat" is meant to be a positive limitation upon the claim

Claim 21 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase "substantially insoluble" is unknown.

Claim 23 is indefinite because the scope of the phrase "substantially insoluble" is unknown.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 7-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brilman et al. (WO 96/31409)("Brilman").

It is first noted that applicants claim a container (claims 1 and 7-20) that does not positively recite any contents, i.e., such as a liquid. Brilman teaches the production of a beer container that is identical to that claimed. See Figs. 1-12 of both the instant application and Brilman. Also see claims 1-13 of Brilman.

Art Unit: 1761

As to the method claims, page 1 of the patent states that beer is typically placed within a container and then a drop of liquid nitrogen, i.e., a first gas, is placed on top of the beer and the container is then quickly sealed. As the insert and process for filling the container are identical, the process limitations will be met. The second gas in the cartridge will be that which comes out of the liquid, i.e., some dissolved gas will come out of solution and be exchanged with that present in the cartridge.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brilman in view of Dunn (WO 96/33618).

Brilman teaches that cited above but does not teach the use of the container for liquids, such as those of claim 24 or that nitrous oxide is used. Dunn teaches the production of milk shake type beverages that are claimed and further, the use of nitrous oxide. See page 1, lines 10-16 and page 3, lines 5-25. It would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art to place the pressurized beverages of Dunn in the container Brilman as it would provide a foam on its surface when opened.

Art Unit: 1761

Applicants' attention is invited to *In re Levin*, 84 U.S.P.Q. 232 and the cases cited therein, which are considered in point in the fact situation of the instant case, and wherein the Court stated on page 234 as follows:

This court has taken the position that new recipes or formulas for cooking food which involve the addition or elimination of common ingredients, or for treating them in ways which differ from the former practice, do not amount to invention, merely because it is not disclosed that, in the constantly developing art of preparing food, no one else ever did the particular thing upon which the applicant asserts his right to a patent. In all such cases, there is nothing patentable unless the applicant by a proper showing further establishes a coaction or cooperative relationship between the selected ingredients which produces a new, unexpected, and useful function. *In re Benjamin D. White*, 17 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 956, 39 F.2d 974, 5 U.S.P.Q. 267; *In re Mason et al.*, 33 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 1144, 156 F.2d 189, 70 U.S.P.Q. 221.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Curtis E. Sherrer whose telephone number is 703-308-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 8AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 703-308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3602 for regular communications and 703-305-3602 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



Curtis E. Sherrer
Primary Examiner
July 9, 2003